



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

vases and marbles; but we can see nothing but a clumsy attempt to familiarize the minds of the humbler and less educated classes of persons not brought up in Romanism to Romish modes of thought, when we see it stated in such a publication, that Masaccio (of whose works but three insignificant and unattractive heads are contained in the collection) was so pious that he "always painted the Madonna on his knees;" or find that its readers are gravely informed that "they ought not to be shocked by things which may seem strange to them, such as seeing in the early paintings 'the Father and the Son painted among the clouds, with angels round them, or as sitting on thrones to judge;' or that the Virgin Mary was constantly painted in those days, because 'people had learned to fear God more than to love Him; and as religion cannot be all fear, they worshipped the Virgin Mary, and made her as beautiful as they could, with the infant Christ in her arms, and thought she could intercede for them,' without adding one word disapproving of either the idea or the practice.

We cannot help fearing that the wide dissemination of such an attractively cheap guide to these pictures may have done something to familiarize the minds of the working classes of Manchester with ideas to which they have previously been strangers, and which a little more vigilance on the part of those who do not overlook the importance of cheap publications might, we humbly think, easily have guarded, by the timely production of an equally cheap and more instructive publication. But when, alas! will Protestants be equally watchful of opportunities as their ever vigilant and indefatigable opponents, who will do anything and everything to inculcate or insinuate their principles, except defend them after the good old manly English style, by sturdy and straightforward argument?

THE following is a slightly abridged notice of an article in the *Durham Chronicle* of the 7th inst., reprinted by the *Tablet* of Saturday last, under the title of "Diocese of Hexham; Soiree and Concert at Houghton-le-Spring." We confess we are heartily ashamed of the Protestants who could be induced by the mere love of amusement to be present at a meeting confessedly designed to promote the purposes of a *Roman Catholic mission*, and at which the health of "his Holiness the Pope" was ostentatiously given, before that of the Queen:—

#### "DIOCESE OF HEXHAM.

##### "Soiree and Concert at Houghton-le-Spring.

"The annual soiree, held in connection with St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, Houghton-le-Spring, took place on Tuesday last. The soiree had been, as usual, looked forward to with considerable interest by many of the inhabitants of Houghton and the surrounding locality, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. Though the beneficial proceeds of the soirees are devoted to the general purposes of the *Roman Catholic mission* at Houghton, yet the proceedings of the day of themselves hardly show that they are intended in aid of any class object, and are therefore joined in by great numbers of many religious denominations. Of late years the entertainments have seldom, if ever, failed to attract a very large assembly of people, and on Tuesday the gathering was larger than on any previous occasion.

"Tea was served in a marquee erected in a field in the rear of the church, and in the school-room connected with that place of worship. Both places were many times filled by the people. In all, about one thousand six hundred persons partook of the refreshment, and about 300 more were admitted to the concert at half price. It was necessary to find the first comers some amusement whilst their more tardy brethren were discussing tea and cakes, and this amusement was found in strolling about the field behind the church, and listening to the strains of *Lady Londonderry's band*. This very excellent band deserved the hearty thanks of the company for the spirit and precision with which they played many excellent and pleasing pieces—amongst which may be mentioned the *Piccolomini Waltzes*, the *New Lancers' Quadrilles*, the *Court of St. James' Quadrilles*, the *Woodbine Polka*, &c. Some of the dance music played was most pleasing, and all was performed in a very superior style. After a considerable number of the assemblage had enjoyed their teas, they took possession of a large

and commodious marquee, which had also been erected in the field, and prepared for a concert of vocal and instrumental music. The marquee, which was capable of holding about 800 persons, was gaily decorated with flags, amongst which were conspicuous those of St. George and St. Michael, the latter being the emblem of the *Patron Saint of the church*. During intervals between the music some sentiments were proposed. The first was given by the Rev. A. Watson, who presided, and who was supported by the Rev. W. Markland, of Sedgfield, and the Rev. James Crolly, of Sunderland. The rev. gentleman said he had to thank them for their attendance. In a lively strain he referred to his having made tea for them for ten years, and was led on to say that if the numbers of those who should come on future occasions should increase upon the number then present, as the latter had upon the number of those present at the first and some succeeding soirees, he should be induced to believe that his tea-making was approaching perfection. He had great reason to be grateful for the increase in the attendance as compared with former years; and he might say that from his first coming into the neighbourhood he had experienced the greatest readiness from their friends about to join them in any reasonable and innocent amusement. He next adverted to the disappearance at Houghton of that religious animosity which, he said, is peculiar to some neighbourhoods. When he first came there he had experienced a little of it, but he was glad to say it had quite gone now, and he had almost quite forgotten it. After saying that they had got into some disorder, in consequence of the pressure upon the services of the ladies at the tea tables, and referring to their having opened the concert themselves—of which he was very glad, he said if he were to begin in order, he would give them several sentiments, and the first of them would be 'The Pope.' They didn't bring them there to hurt any man's feelings. Their object was merely mutual and innocent amusement. They did not mix religion with those things, for they considered that there is a time for religion and a time for amusement. This, he hoped, was a time for amusement, but they knew that they, as good Catholics, must give that recognition of their spiritual superior which was due to him. He therefore proposed 'His Holiness the Pope.' At a subsequent opportunity, Mr. Watson said he had another duty to perform—to give them 'Health, long life, and a happy reign to Victoria, our Queen.' It was their duty to pay due respect to their temporal superiors. The Queen, he said, is the head of temporal superiors in this realm. As there was no time to spare, he begged to give, without further remarks, 'The Queen.' Other sentiments were afterwards given, and a comic song was sung and some racy anecdotes were told by a facetious elderly man, who brought roars of laughter from his audience. Mr. Hemy at the pianoforte, the Misses Blake with their liquid notes, and Lady Londonderry's band also beguiled the time. Meanwhile great numbers of people were enjoying themselves in the field, where many amusing games were being carried on, with apparently no small degree of amusement and delight, not only by the youngsters, but by many 'children of an older growth.' The weather was peculiarly favourable for outdoor amusements. The whole of the day was favoured with most glorious weather, and towards evening the atmosphere was delightfully pleasant, and especially suitable for a little romping on the green turf. At the close of the proceedings, which did not take place till almost ten o'clock, the band played 'God save the Queen,' after which the large assemblage quietly dispersed with the utmost good order and good humour."—*Durham Chronicle*, Aug. 7.

How far the purposes of this Roman Catholic mission may have been promoted by "the beneficial proceeds" of this soiree we cannot say; though probably the money paid for admission by those 1,900 persons was such as to afford a reasonable profit to the rev. tea-maker; but as to the moral effects likely to be produced upon the Protestant mind by either the Piccolomini waltzes, the Lancers' quadrilles, or the Woodbine polka, or even the "comic songs and racy anecdotes," and subsequent "romping upon the green turf," we cannot help supposing them to be almost as equivocal as those of frequenting an Irish pattern, or a station at a holy well on the saint's day in Ireland; though, perhaps, they may have been less actually shocking to the sense of propriety of the good people of England. We mean nothing personally offensive to any clergyman of any religious persuasion, but we cannot help inquiring whether sufficient care can be taken of the Protestants of Houghton-le-Spring, if it be true that such Roman Catholic missionary meetings are really resorted to by "great numbers of various religious denominations?" We think there is a wide difference between the disappearance of that religious animosity which never should be indulged in

anywhere under any circumstances, and the active countenance and assistance of Protestants of various denominations in advancing a Roman Catholic mission to the Protestants of Hexham.

We also read in the *Tablet* the following interesting notice to summer excursionists. Surely it is not the fault of either the hierarchical or railway authorities, if "Religion made easy" does not become universally popular in the present day:—

#### "DIOCESE OF WESTMINSTER.

"A meeting of Catholics was held on Wednesday evening last, in Duke-street, Manchester-square, for the purpose of organising a pilgrimage to Our Lady of Boulogne-sur-Mer. We understand that the South-Eastern Railway have agreed to offer every facility to the undertaking. Our readers will scarcely need to be reminded that his Holiness has lately granted to this sanctuary of Our Lady the Pilgrimage Indulgences of Loretto. Further particulars may be learned on application to Mr. Pagliano, Brook-green, Hammersmith, and of Mr. Wiggley, the honorary secretary, 34, Hart-street, Bloomsbury."

What a pity it will be if the penance of a little sea-sickness should mar the pleasure of this agreeable excursion, and prove a set off against the happiness of securing at so easy a rate the "Pilgrimage Indulgences of Loretto." We cannot refrain from smiling at the idea how the barefooted palmers of the olden time would have wondered at the penance of a first-class railway carriage between London and Folkestone!

#### THE SAFER WAY.

SOME five-and-twenty years ago, the writer of the present article happened to be residing in a small town in one of the southern counties of Ireland. The physician of the place was a learned, skilful, and modest man. He did not cure every one whom he was called to attend, nor did he promise to do so. He availed himself of all the resources of his art with which he was acquainted, and he professed to do no more. He did not know of any panacea, and he was too honest to pretend that he did. The people were satisfied, and considered themselves fortunate in having among them so skilful a doctor. All went on smoothly, till at last there arrived in the town, one fine day, a foreign-looking man, with a profusion of hair on his head and face, and a large diamond ring on his finger. The gentleman began by covering the walls with placards, stating that he was possessed of an infallible remedy for all diseases; that the true art of healing was unknown to any but himself; and, as for the old fashioned doctors, that they were mere humbugs, and that to swallow their drugs was as much as any man's life was worth. Our good old doctor, who saw that the new arrival was a swindling mountebank, took the matter very quietly. When spoken to about the foreigner, he simply replied that it was possible his medicine might, in some cases, effect a cure, though from what he knew of its nature, he deemed the use of it to be highly dangerous. The mountebank, who was a shrewd fellow, did not fail to avail himself of this admission of the doctor. He forthwith had a larger placard than any of the former stuck up, headed "The Safer Way." The contents of the placard were, as nearly as we can recollect, as follows—"Dr. — allows that diseases may be cured by my remedy; I assert that they cannot be cured by his drugs; therefore, it is the safer course for all sick persons to take my medicine, which even my rival admits may effect a cure." Some weak-minded people of our town—for there were such there as in larger places—were actually convinced by this argument. Being naturally easily gulled by impostors, especially when the pretensions of these impostors partook of the marvellous, they were only too ready to swallow any argument, however absurd, which the bearded foreigner could produce in support of the efficacy of his wonderful nostrum.

Now, we have too much respect for the intelligence of the generality of our readers even to suspect that they could be imposed on by the shallow sophistry of that mountebank. And yet, there is a popular Romish argument, which most of our Roman Catholic readers, at least, must have heard, and which, although they may not have observed its weakness, is to the full as sophistical and worthless as that of the quack impostor. The argument is this—"Protestants allow that a Roman Catholic may be saved; the Church of Rome denies that a Protestant, as such, can be saved; therefore it is the safer way to belong to that Church [of Rome] in which salvation is on all sides acknowledged to be possible." This is precisely the mountebank's argument, substituting merely the two Churches for the two doctors; and its unsoundness in the one case may well raise a doubt as to its validity in the other.

But the importance of the subject demands that we should examine this argument a little more nearly. We propose, then, to consider whether our granting a possi-

ability of salvation, though with great hazard, to those in connection with the Church of Rome, and their desiring it to us, be a sufficient argument to induce any man to remain in their Church, or to quit our communion and join theirs, as being the safer course.

Now, either this argument is conclusive in itself, without entering into the merits of the cause on either side, and without comparing the doctrines and practices of both Churches together, or else it is not. If it be not conclusive in itself, without comparing the doctrines and practices on both sides, then the argument is of no use. For if, upon comparison of these doctrines and practices, it appears that the claims of one of the Churches are better founded than those of the other, this alone is a sufficient inducement to a man to cleave to that Church wherein the true doctrine and practices are found; and then this argument is superfluous. But if the argument be good in itself without the examination of the doctrines and practices—as those who employ it pretend it to be—then we must be prepared to admit that a man has reason enough to belong to any Church, whatever her doctrines and practices may be, if she do but anathematize all who differ from her, and if those who differ from her do but allow a possibility of salvation in her communion. Let us, then, first, consider what is the principle on which this argument rests. It is this—that whatever different parties in religion agree in is safest to be chosen. Now, this principle, if carried out to its legitimate consequences, would require that men should give up Christianity itself, and rest in the doctrines of natural religion, because respecting these there is no diversity of opinion. Consequently, the argument proves too much, for it concludes not only against Protestantism, but against Romanism; too; nay, more, against Christianity itself.

Let us next take one or two parallel cases, by which to test the validity of this argument. The Donatists denied the baptism of the Catholics to be valid, while the Catholics acknowledged the baptism of the Donatists. Both sides were agreed that the baptism of the Donatists was good. Therefore, by this argument, the safer way for St. Augustine and the other Catholics of that day would have been to get themselves rebaptized by the Donatists, as by the admission of both sides their baptism was valid. Again, many members of the Church of Rome hold the personal infallibility of the Pope and the lawfulness of deposing kings for heresy to be articles of faith; and, consequently, that whoever does not believe them cannot be saved. But many other Roman Catholics, though they do not believe these things to be matters of faith, yet do not doubt that they who hold them may be saved. Therefore, according to this argument, they ought all to adopt the ultramontane views, because both sides are agreed that they who hold them may be saved. Once more: we read of certain Judaizing teachers in the primitive Church, who "taught the brethren, and said, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts xv. 1). Now, neither St. Paul nor the other Apostles would deny the possibility of the salvation of these Judaizers, though it might be attended with difficulty and hazard. Therefore, according to the argument before us, St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles ought to have gone over to the Judaizers, because it was acknowledged on both sides that they might be saved. These examples, in which the argument in question plainly leads to false conclusions, may serve to show how weak and worthless it is.

But, besides leading to false conclusions, it can be easily shown that gross absurdities may follow from it. Thus, according to this argument, it is always safest to be on the uncharitable side. And yet, uncharitableness would justly be regarded as a strange proof either of a true Christian or a true Church. Charity is one of the most essential marks of Christianity, and what the Apostle says of individual Christians (1 Cor. xiii. 2) is equally true of whole Churches: that "though they have all faith, so that they could remove mountains, and have not charity, they are nothing." Again, if this argument be good, any man might bring over all the world to agree with him in an error which they do not count damnable, provided he do but anathematize all those who do not hold it. All that he requires is a sufficient stock of audacity and uncharitableness. But, surely, nothing can be more senseless than for a man to require me to adopt his opinions because he possesses assurance and wants charity.

But, further, this argument cannot be fairly employed by any Roman Catholic, consistently with his own principles. For, observe, its force depends on this, that we Protestants acknowledge the possibility of salvation in the Church of Rome. But a Roman Catholic ought not to lay any stress on this concession; because, if, as he says, we are so utterly mistaken on other points connected with religion, why not also on this? On his own principles, our very admitting this possibility ought to be a strong presumption against it.

In order, then, to decide on the safer way in a matter of such infinite moment as religion, it will not do to listen to the Church which makes the highest pretensions and pronounces the loudest anathemas. A man must examine, calmly, carefully, and prayerfully, the doctrines and practices of the rival communions, and endeavour to satisfy himself on which side there is a closer conformity to the mind of God, as expressed in

His revealed word. All men may not be competent to conduct such an inquiry; but on those who are competent there rests a solemn obligation, which they cannot, as they value their souls' welfare, shake off or evade. A mere permission that we might, without having any rational grounds on which to justify our convictions, will not suffice. The safer way is not determined by the mere strength of a man's conviction; for we know, on the authority of God Himself, that "there is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

## Correspondence.

### INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The four, or rather five, discordant definitions of the invocation of saints which I noticed (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, July, 1857, page 80) are conclusive evidence that "my letters are very hard reading"—that is, they are unanswerably so. And this, too, must be the opinion of every impartial reader, when he perceives that you cannot defend them, save only by the flimsy and hackneyed assertion that "the fault is in the doctrine of which you had to give an account—not in you." To evade the knotty difficulty presented in these incongruous attempts to explain away our real belief on this subject, you require an explicit statement of the doctrines of my Church respecting this dogma, thus endeavouring to make your readers believe that I have not hitherto offered any explanation thereon. Now, to disabuse your readers of such an opinion, I have only to refer to the number for March, 1857, pages 33, 34, where I have explicitly and in sufficient detail stated our belief; and to number for April, 1857, page 45, where I have treated the subject with equal perspicuity, or, at least, sufficiently so to show that our practice is commensurate with our theory; and next, to number for May, 1857, page 58, for an ample exposure of your sophistical endeavours to prove a difference between this theory and practice; and, lastly, to the specimen of our prayer-book practice, which is in strict accordance with the explanation referred to: all enunciating and developing the same principles, free from the slightest obscurity or ambiguity; all affording indisputable evidence that we worship God as the giver of all good things; that Christ alone is our Mediator with the Father, and that we do not invoke the saints beyond asking them to "pray for us." To ignore these plain and incontrovertible statements, you compliment your readers by telling them that my explanations of the doctrines of the Catholic Church are something abstruse, and beyond the powers of a man of ordinary capacity to understand. But that "you understand these doctrines a great deal too well;" and, "we have already proved that this is not the case;" such are the changes which you ring for the amusement and edification of your readers "of ordinary capacity." As your own statements supply abundant proofs of the truth of the point at issue, I have to observe that you grant (No. for March, 1857, page 34) "the Roman Catholic theory (doctrine of Trent) is, that it is from God the saints derive whatever power they have of complying with the petitions addressed to them;" and further, by this theory you concede (No. for April, 1856, page 46) we must treat the saints as intercessors with God, or joint supplicants with us to obtain benefits from Him, through Christ Jesus, &c.; and to maintain otherwise "would (you say) be a misrepresentation of our doctrines;" and you admit (No. for April, 1857, page 45) "with respect to this theory we are pretty well agreed."

To suppose, then, that men educated in this theory (as every learned Catholic, at least, is) should, contrary to these incalculable, and unconsciously, abandon these theoretical principles, and in their first practical attempt to act upon them worship the saints instead of God, as the dispensers of grace, salvation, &c., or together with God, and with the worship due to God, is so extravagantly incredible a conclusion that I need not stop to confute it. Our practice (the practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books) is, therefore, co-ordinate with our theory (the doctrine of Trent); and our doctrine, simply stated, is this—that "the saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for us; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them; and to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance, to obtain benefits from God, through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is alone our Redeemer and Saviour." (Rom. Tri-d. sess. xxv. de invoc.) With respect to the first part of this statement, you assert (No. for January, 1857, page 3) that "no saint is now reigning with Christ," &c. You qualify this expression, indeed; but you re-assert the same sentiment by implication when you say of Christ, "He is not even Himself reigning now;" and, further, "His kingdom is yet future, and we pray for its glorious advent—'Thy kingdom come.'" But our Lord (Matt. vi. 9, 10) teaches us to say "Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come." He does not teach us to say "My kingdom," but "Thy kingdom"—that is, "may the kingdom of the Father come." So far for you, who would be "eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame." But if we admit your interpretation, the kingdom of the Father is indisputably the kingdom of the Son, so conclusive are your own arguments against you. You say "The people of Jesus shall here-

after reign with Him; but they are not now reigning with Him." St. Paul says of himself, "I desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23). Christ is "King of kings, and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. vi. 15). And He is "King of kings, and they that are with Him are called, and elect, and faithful" (Apoc. xxvii. 14). And Christ Himself says—"Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Apoc. ii. 10). Here, then, we see that Christ is King; and He tells us that His saints are with Him, and He will crown them after their death; and yet you say, "They are not now reigning with Christ." Your readers may, perhaps, give you credit for your very sincere desire to learn the truth; but from these few instances I think they must distrust very much your teaching.

St. Augustine is decidedly opposed to you, too. He says—"Therefore, the Church is now both the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of heaven. And all His saints now reign with Him; different, indeed, from the way in which they shall then (after the resurrection) reign." And, more explicitly still—"The souls of those slain for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God; that is, the souls of the martyrs; their bodies not yet being restored to them, shall reign a thousand years with Jesus."

"Ergo Ecclesia et nunc est regnum Christi, regnumque eorum. Regnant itaque cum illo etiam nunc sancti ejus, aliter quidem, quam tunc regnabunt. Et animas occisorum propter testimonium Jesu, et propter verbum Dei, &c., regnaverunt cum Jesu, mille annis, animas, scilicet, martyrum nondum sibi corporibus suis redditas."—*De Civit. Dei, lib. xx., cap. ix., sec. 1, 2.*

So far, then, the doctrine of Trent is the doctrine both of the Bible and of the primitive Catholic Church. With regard to the second proposition in my statement—namely, that it is good to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance, &c.—you say (No. for July, 1857, page 81, col. 1), "The Virgin Mary is directly asked for protection; and we have shown that such prayers are in accordance with the decrees of the Council of Trent, which approve of our having recourse not only to the intercession of the saints, but to their help and assistance (*opem auxilium et intercessionem*). But your readers are not, perhaps, aware that the parenthetic evidence now addressed by you is perfectly spurious; or that you have, by an unwarrantable interpolation of *intercessionem*, so far altered and disfigured the precise and determinate ideas suggested by the original, thereby fabricated a formula which enunciates as precisely the theory of the tide as it does the theory of the invocation of saints. Now, I ask you, is it "with a very sincere desire to learn the truth" that you thus corrupt the passage; and instead of *ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere*—"to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance"—you make the original appear to be *ad eorum orationes, opem, auxilium et intercessionem*—"to have recourse to their prayers, help, assistance, and intercession"—that by such plain, direct sophistry might create a factitious credibility for the passage now cited? I grant there are errors and mistakes into which men may fall, and into which they do inadvertently fall; but whether this can be the case with respect to this interpolation on the part of a person who professes "that he understands our doctrine a great deal too well," I leave your readers to judge. I have already shown in this paper that you admit it would be a misrepresentation of the doctrines of Trent (Roman Catholic theory) to say that it sanctions direct prayers to the saints; and, as I have shown, you now maintain that such direct prayers to the saints for protection, safety, &c., are in accordance with this theory. Thus do you build up and pull down again at random. You have yet proved exactly—nothing. I have shown above that the first proposition in my "explicit statement" is the doctrine of the Bible and of the early Church. I shall prove that the second proposition admits of a like solution, notwithstanding all your inconsistent, contradictory, and sophistical attempts to prove "that this is not the case." When I find you treating the subject at issue on its real merits, stating fairly its principles, I am ready to admit that you understand it perfectly. But when I still find you, instead of this doctrine, stating inconsistencies, evasions, and patent sophisms, it will be a long day, indeed, before I admit the spurious offspring of such non-natural parents to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

With respect to the word *Θεοτοκος*, although the Council of Ephesus did not adopt the word (a point on which I am yet doubtful), I cannot understand it in the sense of "the bringer-forth of God," or that the Church is responsible for this English equivalent, unless by "the bringer-forth" you mean *mother*; and this opinion appears to me the more reasonable, since the angel Gabriel declared to the Blessed Virgin—"The holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke i. 35); and hence Mary was the *mother* of the Son of God. Elizabeth called Mary the "*MOTHER OF MY LORD*"—*μητέρα του Κυρίου μου* (Luke i. 43); and—"Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us" (Matt. i. 23). Hence, it is manifest that "shall bring forth a Son" means precisely the same thing as a Son (the holy thing); shall be born; then this Son, this Lord, this Emmanuel, this God, was brought forth by (born of) the Blessed Virgin (Matt. i. 25), so that I cannot otherwise understand *Θεοτοκος*, nor do I think it can be otherwise